REMARKS

The Office Action mailed October 8, 2004 has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1-60 are now pending in this application. Claims 1-60 are rejected.

The rejection of Claims 1-60 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Juedes et al. ("Juedes")(WO 01/13261) is respectfully traversed.

Juedes describes a system 100 that fulfill orders placed by a customer 104 from a provider 106 of a product over the internet 102. The provider sends the order information to an e-commerce hub 112 which arranges for transportation and delivery of the product. The hub software automatically selects, based on the order info and predetermined stored criteria, which of a plurality of predetermined carriers should be used to transport the product from the provider to the customer. Notably, Juedes does not allow an order change to be made based on a user's security level clearance.

Claim 1 recites "a method of managing a delivery schedule of an order using a system configured with a server which includes a goods delivery system...said method comprising ...allowing an order change to be made based on a user's security level clearance."

Juedes does not describe or suggest a method of managing a delivery schedule of an order using a system configured with a server which includes a goods delivery system, wherein the method includes allowing an order change to be made based on a user's security level clearance. Moreover, Juedes does not describe or suggest allowing an order change to be made based on a user's security level clearance. Rather, in contrast to the present invention, Juedes describes a delivery system wherein order status is updated or changed without regard to a user's security level clearance. For the reasons set forth above, Claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over Juedes.

14

Claims 2-14 depend from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of Claims 2-14 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 2-14 likewise are patentable over Juedes.

Claim 15 recites "a method of managing a delivery schedule of an order using a system configured with a server...said method comprising...allowing an order change to be made based on a user's security level clearance."

Juedes does not describe or suggest a method of managing a delivery schedule of an order using a system configured with a server, wherein the method includes allowing an order change to be made based on a user's security level clearance. Moreover, Juedes does not describe or suggest allowing an order change to be made based on a user's security level clearance. Rather, in contrast to the present invention, Juedes describes a delivery system wherein order status is updated or changed without regard to a user's security level clearance. For the reasons set forth above, Claim 15 is submitted to be patentable over Juedes.

Claims 16-25 depend from independent Claim 15. When the recitations of Claims 16-25 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 15, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 16-25 likewise are patentable over Juedes.

Claim 26 recites "a computer program storage medium readable by a computer system and encoding a computer program of instructions for executing a computer process for managing deliveries of a goods delivery system...said computer process comprising...allowing an order change to be made based on a user's security level clearance."

Juedes does not describe or suggest a computer program storage medium readable by a computer system and encoding a computer program of instructions for executing a computer process for managing deliveries of a goods delivery system, said computer process comprising allowing an order change to be made based on a user's security level clearance. Moreover, Juedes does not describe or suggest allowing an order change to be made based on a user's

15

security level clearance. Rather, in contrast to the present invention, Juedes describes a delivery system wherein order status is updated or changed without regard to a user's security level clearance. For the reasons set forth above, Claim 26 is submitted to be patentable over Juedes.

Claims 27-39 depend from independent Claim 26. When the recitations of Claims 27-39 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 26, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 27-39 likewise are patentable over Juedes.

Claim 40 recites "an apparatus for managing the delivery of an order from at least one supplier to a respective delivery agent, and from the delivery agent to a respective buyer, given order information, said apparatus comprising...means for allowing an order change to be made based on a user's security level clearance."

Juedes does not describe or suggest an apparatus for managing the delivery of an order from at least one supplier to a respective delivery agent, and from the delivery agent to a respective buyer, given order information, wherein the apparatus includes a means for allowing an order change to be made based on a user's security level clearance. Moreover, Juedes does not describe or suggest a means for allowing an order change to be made based on a user's security level clearance. Rather, in contrast to the present invention, Juedes describes a delivery system wherein order status is updated or changed without regard to a user's security level clearance. For the reasons set forth above, Claim 40 is submitted to be patentable over Juedes.

Claim 41 recites "a method of managing a delivery schedule of a multiple brand order using a system configured with a server which includes a goods delivery system...said method comprises allowing an order change to be made based on a user's security level clearance."

Juedes does not describe or suggest a method of managing a delivery schedule of a multiple brand order using a system configured with a server which includes a goods delivery system, wherein the method includes allowing an order change to be made based on a user's security level clearance. Moreover, Juedes does not describe or suggest allowing an order

16

change to be made based on a user's security level clearance. Rather, in contrast to the present invention, Juedes describes a delivery system wherein order status is updated or changed without regard to a user's security level clearance. For the reasons set forth above, Claim 41 is submitted to be patentable over Juedes.

Claims 42-50 depend from independent Claim 41. When the recitations of Claims 42-50 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 41, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 42-50 likewise are patentable over Juedes.

Claim 51 recites "a method of managing a delivery schedule of a multiple brand order using a system configured with a server which includes a goods delivery system...said method comprises...allowing an order change to be made based on a user's security level clearance."

Juedes does not describe or suggest a method of managing a delivery schedule of a multiple brand order using a system configured with a server which includes a goods delivery system, wherein the method includes allowing an order change to be made based on a user's security level clearance. Moreover, Juedes does not describe or suggest allowing an order change to be made based on a user's security level clearance. Rather, in contrast to the present invention, Juedes describes a delivery system wherein order status is updated or changed without regard to a user's security level clearance. For the reasons set forth above, Claim 51 is submitted to be patentable over Juedes.

Claims 52-60 depend from independent Claim 51. When the recitations of Claims 52-60 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 51, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 52-60 likewise are patentable over Juedes.

17

9D-EC-19335
PATENT

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 102 rejection of Claims 1-60 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing remarks, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

Thomas M. Fisher
Registration No. 47,564
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740
(314) 621-5070

18